

### **REMARKS**

The undersigned Attorney for the Assignee presents these amendments in response to the Office Action mailed May 9, 2003. Claims 1-19, 30-34, and 39-42 are pending in the present application. The Office Action rejected Claim 39, and Claim 40 was objected to. By the present amendment, Claim 39 has been amended, and Claims 41 and 42 have been added. The rejections of the Office Action are traversed for the reasons provided below. The undersigned Attorney for the Assignee respectfully requests reexamination and reconsideration of the application as amended, and further requests an allowance of the pending claims.

#### **The Rejection of Claim 39**

Claim 39 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Sunesson, U.S. Patent No. 4,199,182, in view of Landy, U.S. Patent No. 6,547,218. In view of the present amendments to the claims, the Office Action rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

Claim 39 has been amended to clarify elements "C," "D," and "E," and to add element "F." Amended element "C" is "securing the second end within the at least two clamp arms." (underlining supplied). Amended element "D" is "placing the first end within the means for holding a first end of a strap." (underlining supplied). Amended element "E" is "rotating the body so that a portion of the strap adjacent to the first end of the strap is wound around a portion of the body." (underlining supplied). New element "F" is "securing the position of the strap with an adhesive means." (underlining supplied).

Neither of the cited references, Sunesson and Lundy, disclose or suggest the element, element "F," "securing the position of the strap with an adhesive means." (underlining supplied). Therefore, the cited references fail to disclose each and every

element of amended Claim 39. Thus, amended Claim 39 should be allowable over the cited references.

**Claims 40-42 are Dependent From Claim 39**

Since Claim 40 is dependent from independent Claim 39, for which arguments of patentability have been advanced above, then Claim 40 should also be in condition for allowance.

New claims 41 and 42 are also dependent from independent Claim 39, for which arguments of patentability have been advanced above, and thus Claims 41 and 42 should also be in condition for allowance.

**Notice of Allowance Requested**

Claims 11-19 and 30-34 were allowed by the prior Office Action. By the present amendment, Claims 39-42 are neither disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and should also be in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance for Claims 11-19, 30-34, and 39-42 is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

For at least the reasons given above, it is respectfully submitted that amended Claim 39 defines patentable subject matter in view of the amendments and remarks made above. Further, it is respectfully requested that immediate allowance of the pending claims and notice thereof be issued. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is necessary in order to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below. No additional fees are believed due; however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 11-0855.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher J. Chan  
Reg. No. 44,070  
Attorney for the Assignee

Date: **August 11, 2003**

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP  
1100 Peachtree Street  
Suite 2800  
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-4530  
(404) 815-6048 (direct)  
(404) 815-6555 (fax)  
Attorney Docket No.: 45626/257169  
Attorney File No.: 45626/257169